



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/818,350	03/27/2001	Masami Kanasugi	FUJX 18.514	1201
26304	7590	07/20/2004	EXAMINER	
KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN			DO, CHAT C	
575 MADISON AVENUE			ART UNIT	
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585			PAPER NUMBER	
			2124	

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/818,350

Applicant(s)

KANASUGI ET AL.

Examiner

Chat C. Do

Art Unit

2124

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See below.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See below.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-10.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Best Available Copy**

Part 2(a): In each independent claims 1, 5, and 9-10, the applicant adds the limitations "input data is multiplied always by the same tap factors in a same order, regardless of the change in the number of oversamples" which raise new issues that would require further consideration and search in order the examiner can make a solid decision.

Part 5(c): Based on the un-amended version of claims, D'Luna et al. disclose in Figure 2 an over-sampling FIR filter for filtering with a clock having a frequency higher than a frequency of accepting input data, comprising: a shift register (12) having a plurality of holding parts (11-14) connected in cascade for sequentially accepting input data (CI\_IN); a plurality of selectors (M1-M3) respectively formed corresponding to holding parts for selecting, a predetermined number of tap factors (12 coefficients) from a plurality of tap factors, in which the selecting is done sequentially in each selector in synchronization with clock (1/3 clock); a plurality of multipliers (3 multipliers in Figure 2) formed respectively corresponding to holding parts for respectively multiplying input data held in holding parts, by tap factors selected by selectors corresponding to holding parts; and an adder (A1) for adding the multiplication result (B2-B4) from multipliers and outputting the resultants as output data (OBI), and wherein one or more of selectors change predetermined number of tap factors to be selected and the rest of selectors change patterns of the selected tap factors (14 by the control circuits 15), in accordance with a change in the number of over-samples, which is the number of tap factors to be multiplied by single input data (routing in sequence).



JOHN CHAVIS  
PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2124

Best Available Copy